

REMARKS

In the official action mailed on **16 November 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-32. Examiner rejected claims 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Aholainen et al. (USPN 7,102,640 hereinafter “Aholainen”).

In the telephone interview conducted on **11 February 2008**, Applicant and Examiner discussed possible amendment options. Applicant proposed during the interview that the new amendment would include two parts.

Specifically, the first part of the new amendment would include languages to further clarify **how the client obtains the service profile for the new service**. Examiner acknowledged that the new features might not be taught by Aholainen, and therefore new search for other references might be performed.

Applicant additionally proposed to further clarify that “**the code**” that was generated to implement the specification is the “**device-specific code**.” Examiner generally agreed that the above amendment could overcome Aholainen, and therefore new search for other references might be needed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over Aholainen.

Applicant respectfully points out that Aholainen is directed to providing the user notice of those Bluetooth devices within communication range, while blocking notice about Bluetooth device that the user wishes to ignore (see Aholainen, col. 2, lines 51-54).

In contrast, the instant application teaches a client obtaining a new service profile by **sending a request to the new service, wherein the request includes type information identifying the type of device platform of the client**; and the new service **selects the service profile for the client based on the type**

information of the client (see page 9, lines 12-17 of the instant application). For example, the client can indicate its hardware profile and operation system.

However, there is nothing within Aholainen, either explicitly or implicitly, which suggests the client **sending a request for the new service, wherein the request includes type information identifying the type of device platform of the client; and the new service selects the service profile for the client based on the type information of the client.**

Additionally, the instant application teaches causing the service profile to be installed on the client involves causing **device-specific code** to be generated. This is beneficial because it would not only allow the client to obtain implementations of standard device profiles, but also allow the client to **generate device-specific profiles on-the-fly during the service profile installation process** (see page 10, lines 12-17 of the instant application).

Examiner pointed out that Aholainen teaches “*the service/device icon is a small, graphic bitmap that is displayed on the screen of the client device, having an appearance that serves to describe the service that the server device has to offer*” in col. 2, line 66 to col. 3, line 2. Applicant respectfully points out that a graphic bitmap icon is different from device-specific code at least in that **the graphic bitmap icon only provides “an appearance”, i.e., a graphical description of the service, whereas the device-specific code can perform the actual service after it is installed on the device.**

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 to clarify that in the instant application, the client obtains the service profile by **sending a request to the new service, wherein the request includes type information identifying the type of device platform of the client; and the new service selects the service profile for the client based on the type information of the client.** These amendments find support on page 9, lines 12-17 of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Additionally, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 to clarify that the instant application installs the service profile on the client by causing **device-specific code** to be generated and install. These amendments find support on page 10, lines 12-17 of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-3 and 5-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-13 and 15-20, which depend upon claim 11, claims 22-23 and 25-30, which depend upon claim 21, and claim 32, which depends upon claim 31, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shun Yao/
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 15 February 2008

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com